Newsweek 12/5/66, 25, #2 "Books & journals of left and right" false, esp. of me.
"FORTUNE HUNTERS" - Manchester $2,750,000
26 #3 "No leftist pamphleteer but LIFE"
All earlier "leftist pamphleteers"?
I first said what Newsweek says of "single bullet" in 2/65, not 11/66, & not in LIFE
6/13 - "IMPACT" MAKES ASSUMPTION
all K's injuries by one bullet only
& no fragments caused any of his injuries
In arguing against LIFE & Connally, NW ignores Zap pix only split second after 234, when Doctors & FBI agree K's position made hit possible.
In arguing "delayed reaction", NW ignores contrary medical testimony (bones)
26, #1 Connally cannot have it both ways, as NW would have known if it knew what it was talking about. And how honestly does it write & think when it calls us - of Lane - "scavengers" & fails to mention Manchester, Look & many others on the other side?

2c #3 Those who are "pro-Commission" are "experts" but anti-commission are "clamorous" "scavengers" - what kind of writing is this? Col 2, last 2 sentences, ¶ 1, read ~~of~~ Commission's "mild" factual error by Boswell. If THIS is error, why trust rest? Point out what changes were made in Autopsy to make it "sustain the one-bullet one-assassin Theory" - Weight, out 2 nice points.

Par #2 Hoover does not "rebut" - he does not even answer. Both of his reports to the Com, 12/9, 1/13 do not account for front neck wound or missed shot.

"not one shred of evidence of a conspiracy"

1) Shooting could not be duplicated by ~~[illegible]~~ REAL experts in over official time of 5 seconds
2) Single bullet theory disproved by misrepresented testimony & evidence
3) Evidence of frame up a) rifle b) bullet 399
   c) Alt-looking pix

Comment on Last par. It rules against it. Can we be satisfied with this?

Roberts: 26, col 3:

Comment on undependability of eye-witness testimony vs. M. Smith? Self? 6-7 car lengths behind JFK's vs Smith. Which car by number? Pop from "almost directly over head" This meant sheriff's bldg, not TSBD, for he had not yet reached the corner of Elm & Houston.

27 col 2 "pathologists found that the President had not been hit from the front" Show me where & how!

col, #2 IF WHAT HE GOT FROM WITNESSES WAS "PRODUCT OF CONFUSION, imagination, shock," or "MACABRE" DESIRES, how CAN HE ACCEPT SAME WITNESSES FROM Commission & in Report? ESP BRENNAN, WHO IS SUPPORTED BY NO SOLID EVIDENCE.

YARB "NO GUN HAD BEEN FIRED WITHIN HALF A BLOCK OF HIS CAR" IF TRUE, THE ENTIRE REPORT IS 100% WRONG. DETAIL & ASK R. Questions.

Last ¶ NONSENSE & FICTION.

Roberts 28: ¶1 compare him on Perry on ENTRANCE WOUND VS REPORT & ITS FICTIONS & EVASIONS on JUST THIS POINT & SPECTER'S FAILURE TO SHOW DRAFT AUTOPSY TO PERRY.

¶3,4, HOW CAN HE CALL FRONT-ENTRANCE "LIE" & say that autopsy "ESTABLISHED" FRONT WOUND WAS EXIT? Drs. NEVER DID. AND WHY THE PROPAGANDA DEVICE OF CALLING THIS "BUCHANAN'S THEORY"? WHY NOT DUDMAN'S?

Col2¶1 "high school who had photographed the death car as it sped past him" - WHERE ARE HIS PIX? WHO IS HE? BETZNER?

¶2 "HOW SHE HELD HIM I WILL NEVER KNOW." IMPORTANT? NO. HE COULD KNOW & IT COULD BE IMPORTANT (HIS BODY ON CAR FLOOR NOT SEAT) Bottom on REWRITING HISTORY - compare with commission.

Col 3
Bottom "UNPROBABILITY OF THE NUMBER OF SHOTS": This is false, for more than 3 can be proved

Bottom & top 29 Rowland - "Lied to FBI agents & the Commission on a half a dozen provable test questions" vs Brennan, Markham - & only 2, & not one FBI agent put on stand & not even named in Report!! NOTHING R SAID OF WHAT HE SAW REPORTED.

2 9th ¶ Magic bullet "relatively unscarred"?
entirely so

"Found on" Connally's stretcher? Show me evidence

Read p. 2 & ask for evidence he quote? Does not exist. & he makes no ~~to~~ mention of doctors.

'Same man', ref. to 3 of film. What was its speed?

Lengthy quote on Connally to express disbelief that Connally was unaware of some wounds - did he first read the test. of the doctors, who said C's belated reaction was normal

#2 Commission on "gave credence to the most believable statements of the most credible witnesses" - Whaley - Brennan, Markham

& "relied heavily on" "tangible" evidence: "movie films" (only) "documents establishing ownership" of rifle - which it didn't,

Col 3, #1) ask him to relate this to [illegible] & my book

The question is not how "this thing worked"

The [illegible] of the commission are - &.

What is wrong with "self-appointed critics" in our society? Should writers not be? But he:

"Big conspiracy" ploy - RFK, all others - jazz!